

POLLOCK'S ORDEAL.

Hard Pushed in His Cross-Examination by Col. James.

He Admits that His Divorce Testimony Was False.

His Father Denies All His Servant-Girl Daughter's Allegations.

Col. E. C. James, counsel for Mrs. Ellen Pollock in her \$50,000 suit for damages against Millionaire Alexander Pollock, for alienating the affections of her husband and his son Edward E. Pollock, is evidently strengthening the case of his client by his cross-examination, in Part II. of the Court of Common Pleas, of her husband.



EDWARD E. POLLOCK.

He succeeded yesterday in getting young Pollock to admit that he had married again since obtaining the Dakota divorce, at which, for the jury's benefit, the Colonel feigned great surprise, although Pollock's marriage to the young woman, who followed him to Dakota for the purpose, was published long ago in the daily papers.

The Colonel also drew from young Pollock that since he had left his wife he has been living most of the time with his parents.

This morning when he again put the youthful husband upon the stand the courtroom was crowded with highly interested spectators.

Col. James got young Pollock to produce two letters written by him in November 1930, addressing him as "Eddie," and pleading with him to do what was right or else give her a final decision as to what he would do.

Pollock wrote that during all the time his wife lived at 28 West One Hundred and Thirty-fifth street he stayed only about twenty nights.

"Didn't you swear that you lived there with her all the time?" asked Col. James.

"If I did I was mistaken."

"Will you swear that you didn't so testify?"

"No, I won't."

"Now, you tell the truth then, how?"

"Now, you lied in the Dakota court?"

Lawyer Thain vigorously objected.

You said yesterday that your wife called you 'Eddie'?"

"She did."

"And you swear that you were not a thief?"

"Yes, sir."

"And you opened a registered letter, your wife sent your father?"

"It's object," shouted Lawyer Thain. "It's unfair, incompetent, immaterial."

"Perfectly fair, perfectly competent, perfectly material," quietly observed the Court.

Young Pollock said he had authority to open all his father's letters, and destroy them if he saw fit.

"Mr. A. O. Salter loaned it to me."

"Have you paid Salter?"

"How much?"

"Oh! odd sums now and then" (continued).

"Ten cents?" (The jury again laughed at the car-fare tender to Mrs. Pollock from a wealthy father).

"Well, five cents, then?"

Young Pollock, in his reply, On redirect examination Pollock said that his wife forced him, by threats to marry her, after he had refused, to swear, his wife never asked him to come and live with her.

He swore that his father, after he had confessed his escapade to him, had given him as much as \$75 at one time to give to his wife, and other sums at other times. He himself had paid the expenses attending the birth of the first child.

Pollock also swore that on one occasion his wife had threatened him with a revolver.

On re-cross-examination Col. James asked whether the father referred to reached his wife or not. He gave it to her, he said, after he had refused, to marry her, he to John F. McIntyre, he to a Mr. Whelan who, Pollock supposed, had given it to Mrs. Pollock's cousin.

Alexander Pollock, the defendant, was the next witness. He swore that he had known the plaintiff since 1881, when she was a child of five years of age.

The first knew of his son's marriage July 28, 1930, when a telephone message came from his office saying that a woman with a child was there claiming that she was his wife.

Mr. Pollock hustled downtown as fast as he could. The woman was gone when he reached there, but he soon Eddie came in and, although Mr. Pollock didn't say so, it is probable that there was some conversation between the two men.

When it was all over Mr. Pollock knew just how he had become a father-in-law and a grandpa.

Pollock later swore solemnly that he had never tried to get Eddie to leave his wife, although she was a quasi-morganatic spouse.

He afterwards met Ellen at the Hotel Royal, at her request, with his lawyer, Mr. Salter. She wanted money and told him to give it to her.

He denied that he told her he would give her \$50,000 in consent to a separation from his son.

In the middle of December, 1930, Ellen called on him at his home, and told him that she was going to leave him.

He said that he was not at home at the time, and that she was not his wife.

"What are you doing here?"

"This is my home and I'm going to stay here."

"I rent these apartments. I haven't a room for you and don't think your room for you and don't think your room for you."

Then he called a policeman and had her removed. His wife had gone to the office and told him that she was taking charge of the flat. That was the first he knew of her presence there.

He never had the custody of the child, and the money as they wished to make a living dishonorably, and never told her that he wanted a divorce.

He never had the custody of the child, and the money as they wished to make a living dishonorably, and never told her that he wanted a divorce.

He never had the custody of the child, and the money as they wished to make a living dishonorably, and never told her that he wanted a divorce.

He never had the custody of the child, and the money as they wished to make a living dishonorably, and never told her that he wanted a divorce.

He never had the custody of the child, and the money as they wished to make a living dishonorably, and never told her that he wanted a divorce.

He never had the custody of the child, and the money as they wished to make a living dishonorably, and never told her that he wanted a divorce.

He never had the custody of the child, and the money as they wished to make a living dishonorably, and never told her that he wanted a divorce.

He never had the custody of the child, and the money as they wished to make a living dishonorably, and never told her that he wanted a divorce.

He never had the custody of the child, and the money as they wished to make a living dishonorably, and never told her that he wanted a divorce.

MCKEE'S JURY GOES OUT.

Now Considering the Case of the Accused Brooklyn Aldermen.

District-Attorney Ridgway Makes a Strong Plea for Conviction.

The case of Alderman William McKee, who has been on trial this week before Judge Moore in the Court of Sessions, Brooklyn, for complicity in the alleged Columbia frauds, will go to the jury this afternoon.

When court opened this morning District-Attorney Ridgway elected to go to the jury on the second count of the indictment, which charges that McKee aided and abetted Patrick Ross, James H. Pigot and others in presenting a false and fraudulent bill for \$11,000 against the city.

Lawyer Edward O'Dwyer then began to sum up for the defense.

In the course of his remarks Mr. O'Dwyer thanked the Court for allowing the defendant such a speedy trial, which, he said, McKee had desired since the indictment was filed. He complimented District-Attorney Ridgway, who, he said, was the most graceful District-Attorney in the United States.

He then proceeded to argue from the testimony. He insisted that there was no evidence on which the defendant could be convicted.

The jury must lay aside the opinions they might have formed from the evidence and acquit McKee.

The speaker told how the money for the Columbia bill was provided, and then rehearsed the story told by Alderman McKee, that there was a verbal contract with Ross whereby he would pay for something over \$11,000.

The District-Attorney had failed to prove that the materials and labor in constructing the bill were paid out of earnings in settlement of damage suits and improvements on the property.

It is said that various plans have been discussed to bring about such a result, and according to report, Russell Sage in favor of McKee's plan.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

Money lent all the way from 7 to 20 per cent on call, closing at 20, and the stringency was again making the market for the leading drawers reduced their posted rates for bills on London to 4.84 for 60 days and 4.88 for 90 days.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

Money lent all the way from 7 to 20 per cent on call, closing at 20, and the stringency was again making the market for the leading drawers reduced their posted rates for bills on London to 4.84 for 60 days and 4.88 for 90 days.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

Money lent all the way from 7 to 20 per cent on call, closing at 20, and the stringency was again making the market for the leading drawers reduced their posted rates for bills on London to 4.84 for 60 days and 4.88 for 90 days.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

Money lent all the way from 7 to 20 per cent on call, closing at 20, and the stringency was again making the market for the leading drawers reduced their posted rates for bills on London to 4.84 for 60 days and 4.88 for 90 days.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

Money lent all the way from 7 to 20 per cent on call, closing at 20, and the stringency was again making the market for the leading drawers reduced their posted rates for bills on London to 4.84 for 60 days and 4.88 for 90 days.

STOCKS ACTIVE AND WEAK.

Bank Failures and Tight Money Help to Pull Down the List.

Plans of Sage and Manhattan—Affairs in Wall Street.

WALL STREET, Friday, June 23.—The bears made another attempt this morning to bring about demoralization in the stock market.

The run on the banks in California and the heavy shipments of currency from this center to San Francisco offered them a pretext for a vigorous demonstration against the market.

A well-known trader who has hugged the short side closely for some time put in an order to sell 500 General Electric at 70 right after the gong sounded. The stock was quickly snapped up, and the price advanced 1 1/2 points.

The next stock attacked was Chicago Gas, which was sold down suddenly from 70 3/8 to 69. This also failed to accomplish its purpose, and light offerings for the long account caused a recovery to within a fraction of 70.

The general list advanced 1 1/2 per cent, and later partially recovered.

Reading sold below 13 on the abandonment of the readjustment plan, as announced in "The Evening World" yesterday.

In the afternoon stocks were weakened by additional bank failures out West.

The declines were not large, however, and business was of a hand-to-mouth character.

It is believed that the Manhattan directors have in contemplation the declaration of a stock dividend, ostensibly to represent money paid out of earnings in settlement of damage suits and improvements on the property.

It is said that various plans have been discussed to bring about such a result, and according to report, Russell Sage in favor of McKee's plan.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

Money lent all the way from 7 to 20 per cent on call, closing at 20, and the stringency was again making the market for the leading drawers reduced their posted rates for bills on London to 4.84 for 60 days and 4.88 for 90 days.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

Money lent all the way from 7 to 20 per cent on call, closing at 20, and the stringency was again making the market for the leading drawers reduced their posted rates for bills on London to 4.84 for 60 days and 4.88 for 90 days.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

Money lent all the way from 7 to 20 per cent on call, closing at 20, and the stringency was again making the market for the leading drawers reduced their posted rates for bills on London to 4.84 for 60 days and 4.88 for 90 days.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

Money lent all the way from 7 to 20 per cent on call, closing at 20, and the stringency was again making the market for the leading drawers reduced their posted rates for bills on London to 4.84 for 60 days and 4.88 for 90 days.

The inquiry is light and there are a few more bills in sight. Discounts in London are being made.

It is estimated that the shipments of currency from the city during the week will be about \$1,000,000.

A dispatch from Chicago says: "New York Bankers have agreed to a 10 per cent premium. The changes in the general list were minor, but speculation was weak on tight money."

HIGGINS CALLED TO TESTIFY.

Says He Was Not Present When Arnold Was Murdered.

McAlone, Who Was Said to Have Fled, Also Testifies.

LONG ISLAND CITY, L. I., June 23.—The trial of Harry Higgins, the ex-employee of Simons stove factory, accused of the murder of Bertram E. Arnold, a private detective, who was slain last night during a strike, was continued this morning before Justice Bartlett.

The first witness was James Armstrong, who was Financial Secretary of the Stove-Moulders during the strike.

He had been summoned by the prosecution to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

Inspector McKee, who is a private detective, was called to the stand to testify that he saw Higgins on the night of the murder, but he was called again this morning to give the defense, and after an unimportant question was taken in hand by District-Attorney Fleming, who questioned him with regard to the statement that Higgins claimed Arnold threatened his life.

SAYD TO BE "LITTLE FATTY."

But Thomas Hootor Says He Is a Real Estate Dealer.

Strange Case of Identity for the Police to Unravel.

What appears to be one of the most remarkable instances of mistaken identity that the police of New York have ever had occasion to deal with will be investigated by Justice Voorhies in the Jefferson Market Police Court late this afternoon.

The prisoner who is awaiting investigation and examination has been positively identified as a lawyer and precinct police court clerk as a notorious criminal known as "Little Fatty."

On the other hand the prisoner has been identified by Lawyer A. C. Francis and examined and sworn to by E. Hootor, a respectable, honest real estate broker, of One Hundred and Thirty-sixth street and the Western House, who was formerly a clerk in his office.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.

The case is a strange one, and the police are at a loss to know how to proceed.